

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached new sheet including Fig. 3 is added.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed May 6, 2009 in the above-identified application.

New claims 13 is added. Therefore, claims 1-13 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1 and 12 are amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by Applicant's disclosure, see, with regard to claim 1, for example, Fig. 1 and Specification, page 5, lines 18-20.

The Drawings are amended to add new Fig. 3 illustrating a fan for cooling the first cooler 12 and the cooler for cooling the coolant in the vehicle's engine 14 illustrated in Fig. 2, as discussed at Specification, page 3, lines 27-32. The Specification is amended correspondingly. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

Applicant's Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the opportunity of a telephone interview conducted on June 26, 2009. The following will serve as Applicant's Statement of Substance of Interview. Applicant's representative proposed amending claim 1 to cite a compressor positioned at the inlet line and the return line recirculates the exhaust gases to a position of the inlet line downstream of the compressor. The Examiner agreed that the cited art does not disclose or suggest such features.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Schonfeld, U.S. Patent No. 5,607,010, in view of Aupperle et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0050374. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 requires an arrangement for recirculation of exhaust gases in a supercharge combustion engine, the arrangement comprising a compressor position at the inlet line and configured to compress the first air, and a return line comprising a connection to the exhaust line and configured to recirculate the exhaust gases from the exhaust line to a position of the inlet line downstream of the compressor.

Schonfeld and Aupperle do not disclose or suggest such features, and the Office Action does not allege that they do so. Schonfeld discloses heat exchangers 12 and 13 for cooling the gases in the EGR (Exhaust Gas Recirculation) system 10, and adding the exhaust gases that have passed through the heat exchangers 12 and 13 to fresh air supplied at 11 and feeding this mixture to compressor 5 and then through charge air cooler 7 just before the mixture is fed back to the supercharged diesel engine 2 (Schonfeld, Fig. 1; column 3, lines 3-7).

Even taken together in combination, Schonfeld and Aupperle do not disclose or suggest a return line configured to recirculate the exhaust gases from the exhaust line to a position of the inlet line downstream of the compressor as required by claim 1.

Claims 2-7, 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claims 8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Schonfeld and Aupperle in view of Bailey, U.S. Patent No. 6,003,315.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Schonfeld and Aupperle in view of Watanabe et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,720,341. Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Bailey does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Schonfeld and Aupperle as they relate to the above-cited features of claim 1. Also, Watanabe does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Schonfeld and Aupperle as they relates to the above-cited features of claim 1. Further, the Office Action does not allege that Bailey and Watanabe discloses or suggest such features. Therefore, since claim 8 depends from claim 1 it is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 11 and 12 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and therefore this rejection is moot.

New Claim

New claim 13 is added so as more fully to claim patentable aspects of Applicant's invention. New claim 13 is fully supported by Applicant's disclosure, see, for example, Specification, page 3, lines 27-32.

Claims 13 depends from claim 1 and is therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims of the application are respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON June 29, 2009

RCF:GB/jl

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700